ENTERED

January 08, 2018 David J. Bradley, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MCALLEN DIVISION

§	
§	CIVIL ACTION NO. M-15-469
§	
§	CRIMINAL NO. M-14-971-02
§	
§	
	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Pending before the Court is Movant's motion to vacate, set aside, or correct sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255, which motion had been referred to the Magistrate Court for a report and recommendation. On November 21, 2017, the Magistrate Court issued the Report and Recommendation, recommending that Movant's section 2255 claims be dismissed with prejudice, and that a Certificate of Appealability be denied upon the issuance of this Court's final order. The time for filing objections has passed, and no objections have been filed.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation for clear error. Finding no clear error, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation in its entirety. Accordingly, Respondent's Motion for More Definite Statement (Dkt. Entry No. 5) is **DENIED** as moot, and Movant's section 2255 claims are **DISMISSED** with prejudice. A Certificate of Appealability is **DENIED**.

As noted by the Fifth Circuit, "[t]he advisory committee's note to Rule 72(b) states that, '[w]hen no timely objection is filed, the [district] court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Douglas v. United Services Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)(quoting Fed. R. Civ. P.72(b) advisory committee's note (1983)) *superceded by statute on other grounds by* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), *as stated in* ACS Recovery Servs., Inc v. Griffin, No. 11-40446, 2012 WL 1071216, at *7 n.5 (5th Cir. April 2, 2012).

SO ORDERED this 8th day of January, 2018, at McAllen, Texas.

Randy Crane

United States District Judge